



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,484	01/11/2002	Larry C. Frame	020375-007400US	9883
20350	7590	07/06/2005	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			LE, DEBBIE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/044,484	FRAME ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	DEBBIE M. LE	2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 July 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings were received on 4/28/04. These drawings are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-20, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabasakalian et al (US patent 6,745,211 B2) in view of Kahn et al (US Patent Application No. 2003/0004724 A1).

As per claim 1, Kabasakalian discloses a method for extracting related information from electronic files, wherein each file includes a plurality of records and wherein each record includes at least one field for containing data (col. 4, lines 52-55), the method comprising:

a) in response to an input that designates at least one field as a key segment (as a user inputs verified data into the identifier fields) (see col. 9, lines 22-23), comparing data contained in the key segment of each record of a first file to data in a related key segment of each record of a second file (as an unverified data record is compared with

the reference data record to identify a matching reference data record) (see col. 2, lines 27-32, col. 9, lines 24-29);

b) upon each occurrence of a match of data in the key segment of a record in the first file to data in the related key segment of a record in the second file (as the matching verified data record is then output) (see col. 9, lines 39-40, col. 7, lines 26-32), creating a record in a temporary electronic file (as verified data record be output to the reporting portion 340 of the corresponding matching data record) (see col. 5, lines 50-51, col. 6, line 47, col. 7, lines 33-35), wherein the record in the temporary file includes at least one field and wherein that at least one field includes a copy of the matching data (as the reporting portion includes identifier fields 662, 664, 666; and the identifier fields 662, 664, 666, each contain identifier data, of the matching verified data record, respectively) (see col. 7, lines 47-55);

c) selecting data from the temporary file and (d) outputting the selected data (as the data record output portion 430 outputs the matching verified data record to the unsolved master data record, then the system performs after a new association is made in the reference data filed memory 230 between a reference data record and a verified data record, creating a new matching verified data record) (col. 6, lines 25-32).

Kabasakalian does not explicitly teach the matching data from the first and second files. However, Kahn teaches the matching data from the first and second files (as the verbatim text window 606 shows the identically match what was said in the underlying dictated audio filed 205 of comparison of the two transcribed text A and B (Fig. 6, par. 105-107). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement the step of recording the matching record from both first and second files so that each of these match scenarios are constructed by the end user with the GUI as disclosed by Kahn, and each record will be tested through each scenarios in turn in order to identify whether or not a specific data record will be accepted for correcting records in a database (see Kahn par. 109).

As per claim 2, Kabasakalian teaches thereafter deleting the temporary file (col. 8, lines 18-52, col. 10, line 40-49).

As per claim 3, Kabasakalian teaches for additional files, repeating steps a), b) and c) using an additional file as the first file and the temporary file as the second file (Fig. 10, col. 11, lines 37-46).

As per claims 4-5, Aiken teaches wherein the first file is stored in electronic form on magnetic tape, media selected from a group consisting of solid state memory, magnetic disk memory, and optical memory (Fig. 2).

As per claim 7, Kabasakalian teaches wherein a record of the temporary file created upon a match of data between records in the first and second files contains less than all of the data from the matching records of the first and second files (as display only matches or differences (data records without matching verified data records) data records) (col. 9, lines 35-40).

As per claims 8-9, Kabasakalian teaches selecting data from the records of the temporary file based in part on logic operators, wherein the logic operators are selected from a group consisting of less than, greater than, equal to, not-equal-to, less-than-or-

equal-to, greater-than-or-equal-to, in and not in (as when selecting the resolve button 966, the unverified data record is compared to a list of reference data records to produce a matched record or difference record based on user specified, the resolve button performs a logic comparison: match record is equivalent to “equal to”) (col. 9, lines 35-40, col. 9, lines 1-15).

Claims 10, 18, and 24 are rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 arguments.

Claims 11-13, 15-17, 19-20, 22-23 have similar limitations as state in dependent claims 2-5, 7-9; therefore, they are rejected under the same subject matter.

Claims 6, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabasakalian et al (US patent 6,745,211 B2) in view of Kahn et al (US Patent Application No. 2003/0004724 A1) and further in view of Aiken (US patent 6,658,622 B1).

As per claims 6, 14 and 21, Kabasakalian and Kahn does not explicitly teach sorting the records of the first file based on data contained in the key segment. However, Aiken teaches sorting the records of the first file based on data contained in the key segment (as document are sorted, col. 11, lines 47-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references to implement the step of sorting records of the document in order to determine where the boundaries of the documents so that

the position value indicating matching position in the other documents (i.e., when comparing for matching) is easier to identify.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN BREENE can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DEBBIE M LE
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

Debbie Le

June 20, 2005.